



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a strong conviction, that such modes of warfare are rather expedients to cover the ignominious retreat of ignorance, than the natural weapons of men of learning and ability, whether acting on the defensive or the aggressive side. We can see nothing disgraceful in admitting an error, but, on the contrary, true magnanimity in relinquishing it, when we can no longer defend our position without resorting to ill-feeling or personal abuse. We, laymen, at least, who have nothing either to gain or lose by upholding particular opinions, would, we think, be unpar on-able if we did not preserve a calm and kindly temper in all our controversies.

If God has given men an infallible living guide, laymen should be but too glad to avail themselves of such guidance the moment they can discover that it is really such. If God has *not* given men such a guide, all men should be humble enough to bless God, and be contented with his infallible written word, and the assistance of his ordained ministers to interpret it aright. If God has created a purgatory, as well as a heaven and a hell, any man who disbelieves in it is to be pitied for his ignorance; but if God has *not* created a purgatory, but only a heaven and hell, those who trust in a future purgation for their sins, are under a delusion of the most pitiable kind. But what is there either in the belief or disbelief in such a guide or in such a place to arouse men's passions and engender strife? Truth accepts no homage at the expense of brotherly love, and men in vain delude themselves if they conceive, that in exciting hatred towards men they are promoting either the glory of God or the exaltation of truth. Truth can never lose by fair argument; and if any success has attended our efforts (and we have abundant and most satisfactory reasons to know that it has been great), we attribute it altogether to our fixed resolution, that whether successful or not in defending our own views, or refuting the opinions of those with whom we differ, we would still persevere in attempting to carry on our investigations in a calm and candid spirit of fair play and kindness.

We had intended, but our space will not permit us to do so in our present number, to take a brief review of the principal topics which have been discussed in our pages, and the propositions which, we conceive, we have established. They include some of the deepest interest, and not a few of which have created great excitement in the world, and, probably, will do so to the end of time; though, doubtless, multitudes will be added to the one side or the other, according to the success or failure of the exertions made on either side to advocate the truth of their respective opinions. We feel, however, that so far from having given publication to all the materials for thought and arguments at our disposal, we are still but at the threshold of our great subject, with a large field of usefulness before us, if it pleases God to afford us time and means to cultivate it to advantage. What we have as yet done appears to us little more than to have somewhat softened prejudice, and gained a hearing among those who at present differ from us; and if our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen will but honestly and spiritedly do their part in the matter, we cannot doubt but that the rising generation in Ireland will be able to come to some agreement, one way or the other, on the great subjects which have so long distracted them; and may be able to realize that amount of Christian unity and brotherly love which befits them as fellow countrymen, and still more as the followers of that lowly but sublime exemplar, who, when He was reviled, reviled not again—whose characteristic precept was, to "love our enemies," and who practically fulfilled it, when, even amid the agonies of the cross, he exclaimed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

RELIGIOUS INQUIRY IN AMERICA.

(From the New York Irish Evangelist.)

DIALOGUE.

Good morning to ye's, Father Donnelly.

Pr. Good morning a chuachil. What's the good news with you?

John. Why, your reverence, I am in good health, but I am sorely puzzled by a small question put to me by a spalpeen on the road the other day, and I want the aid of your reverence to answer it in a sensible manner.

Pr. Ah, John, what can it be? The youth are becoming mighty shrewd in our day.

John. Well, your reverence, he asked me, "from how much sin are true believers cleansed by the blood of Christ?" Is it from a little, the half, or the whole of the sin? Now, I want your decision, your reverence, as a learned gentleman.

Pr. Well, John, as a priest, it would have been my duty merely to tell you that you have nothing to do with such questions, but the clergy; but as you have asked my opinion as a learned man, I must tell you, that as Christ is a whole Saviour, his blood or his atonement cleanses from all our sins.

John. Good, your reverence, what you say accords with 1st John i. 7 (Douay Bible), where it says—"The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth from all sin?"

Pr. Ah, John, you have been reading the Bible, have you? You must stop that, or you will soon be quarrelling with your mother, the Church.

John. No, your reverence, quarrelling is not very Christian in any one. Still, if the blood of Christ cleanses the believer from all sin, I have been thinking what can be the use of praying to the Virgin, to Peter, Paul, or any other of the saints; and, especially, what can be the need for the fires of Purgatory to cleanse the soul, when Christ has cleansed it already.

Pr. There, John, there—you are going to be a heretic, and if you do not stop reading the Bible, and thinking as you do, I shall be compelled to curse you from the holy altar.

John. O, your reverence, I did not intend to offend you; the blessed book says, "Bless and curse not;" and the only example of cursing we have is, where Peter cursed and swore that he did not know Jesus Christ, and so denied him, which your reverence knows is a very wicked example.

Pr. How dare you, sir, make use of such language in my presence; don't you know that I have power to ask God to send your soul to the lowest pit of hell?

John. Yes, your reverence, but will God do your asking? Your commission requests of you to preach the Gospel, and not to curse your parishioners; that is the work of Satan, and you ought to leave it to him. But if you do, I shall appeal to Jesus Christ, our High Priest in heaven, whose blood cleanseth from all sin.

Pr. Begone—begone out of my sight, you will disgrace your church—always quarrelling with God and his word.

Pr. Begone, I say; begone out of my sight.

THE IRISH WANDERER IN SEARCH OF TRUTH.

I believe I told you in my last what my feelings were while reading the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of Matthew's Gospel. I admired the truthfulness and simplicity with which the Saviour taught the people; and nothing but my eagerness to know what the next chapter contained, hindered me from giving it a second reading. As I passed on to glance at the 8th chapter, my eyes became riveted on the following words:—"And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid and sick of a fever. And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose and ministered unto them."—Matt. viii. 14, 15.

What! said I, Peter's wife's mother! Can it be possible that St. Peter had a wife? I read it again and again, but could come to no other conclusion than the fact, that the Apostle Peter was a married man, had a wife, kept house, lived by fishing, and occasionally had at his house the Son of God. This circumstance, small as it may appear, was to me then a surprising discovery, and suggested a thousand other thoughts, which I cannot now relate.—Amongst other things, I supposed that if it could be right for Peter to have a wife while in the company of Jesus Christ, it certainly would not be wrong for any of those who profess to succeed him in office to have one now, unless there was some law decreed by God to prohibit their having one.

But knowing full well, that the Church of Rome, which pretends to rest on Peter, regards it a much greater crime in one of her priests to marry a wife and live with her, than that he should daily commit adultery, I could not help twisting and turning this matter in my head for a great length of time. I read in the Old Testament (Gen. ii. 18), where God said celibacy was not good, and came to the conclusion that God must have somewhere else contradicted that saying, else the Church which taught that celibacy is good, contradicts their Maker, and in so many words, says we are too holy to keep the commandments of God.

It is a constant boast of the Romish priests that they

hold the ancient faith and ancient customs delivered to the Apostles, but here is a very ancient custom, which they have not only neglected sadly, but they solemnly swear upon oath they will oppose during their natural life. I certainly thought all the time, they must have some good foundation, for setting aside and deadily opposing a custom, which is an immutable law of Jehovah, established for the good of man, without limitation or exception.

I kept this thing in view while reading the remaining part of the New Testament, and found, so far from its being prohibited, that the Apostles said marriage was honourable in all; that is, among all classes of society. See Heb. xiv. 4. It appears some heretics in the days of the Apostles opposed it as dishonourable in the clergy to marry and have their wife and children round them; as it was pretended they would have more care for their family than for the Church of God: and this is the very reason now urged by those who are guilty of trampling under foot this holy institution of God. But the Apostle Paul, in writing to Timothy, says no men are fit for the office of bishop or deacon who are not married men; for the man who cannot govern his own family well, cannot govern a larger family; that is, the congregation under his charge: and this he declares to be a direct revelation of the Holy Spirit. See 1 Tim. 3rd and 4th chapters.

When this subject is urged upon the Romish priests, they tell you at once they hold marriage to be a sacrament, and forbid it to none but those who have taken upon themselves vows of perpetual celibacy. Thus, by subtle and sophistical arguments, they evade the curious and confound the credulous. The truth is, they forbid marriage to none but the very men whom the Holy Spirit commands to marry. These men they forbid to marry, under the pretence that they have voluntarily taken upon themselves vows of perpetual celibacy.

But it is not true that these men are left to their voluntary consent in making these vows; they are compelled to make such vows before they can enter the church. No man can become priest, monk, or friar, until he makes these vows. We have known some men, who, after they had spent years in learning the priest's trade, and their parents had spent the last shilling in supporting them in college (expecting they were sowing a seed which would in a short time yield a rich harvest, for it is generally understood, if a man can make his son a priest, the fortune of the whole family is made), come home almost broken-hearted, because they could not enter the priesthood, on account of some conscientious scruples they had about making these vows.

There is no alternative, they must make the vows, or else relinquish the idea of being a priest. Now, if these men were allowed to enter the priesthood, and it was afterward left to their own conscientious convictions, whether they would make vows of perpetual celibacy or not, whether they would live married or single, then might it be said, with truth and propriety, that they took voluntary oaths of perpetual celibacy.

The plain logic of the matter, then, is something like this. In the apostolical days, a man may be a bishop or deacon of the Apostolical Church of Christ, and have a wife and children. The Church of Rome claims to be the Apostolical Church of Christ; but no man can be a bishop or deacon of the Church of Rome and have a wife and children; therefore the Church of Rome is not the Apostolical Church of Christ. Again—In the Apostolical days, any one who believed that Jesus was the Messiah, and had faith in him, may become a member of the Apostolical Church of Christ without further taxing his conscience with traditions, vows, &c.; but no man can become a member of the Church of Rome until he believes, or swears that he believes, a numberless heap of traditions, called Apostolical, and a number of doctrines contrary both to Scripture and reason, and makes vows of perpetual celibacy (for a common Romanist is not a member of the Roman Catholic Church); therefore the Roman Catholic Church is not the Apostolical Church of Christ.

Several other things arrested my attention, which I intend to communicate to you in future numbers. Fearing that I have already trespassed on your time and room, I will break off here, which I did not intend to do when I commenced.

We copy the two foregoing articles from a New York paper, *The Irish Evangelist*, and think they afford a cheering proof that intelligent Irish Roman Catholics are using their intellects in America as well as in Ireland. Truly, the Roman Catholic priesthood seem not quite so likely to have it all their own way during the next half century, as they had during the last. The laity are beginning to bestir themselves in all directions, and there seems to be nothing but trouble before the priesthood in all countries where the freedom of the press exists. Where it does not, men must remain slaves both in politics and religion, and deserve to be so for submitting to have the doors of knowledge closed against them by the iron hand of tyranny, ecclesiastical or civil. The day will come when tyranny will be shaken off even by the most indolent and effeminate races, and then will freedom of speech and of thought gladden the sunny plains and hills of Spain and Italy. In the meantime, all true Britons, whether in England or America, have a deeply responsible duty to perform, in using the freedom of the press aright, and proving themselves

worthy of such a blessing. We think the cause of religious freedom among the Irish in America owes much to the exertions of *The Irish Evangelist*, which we have been reading for upwards of twelve months, and it would give us sincere pleasure to hear that some of our wealthier readers in England or Ireland would assist the good work in which it is engaged, by sending some pecuniary assistance to the editor and proprietor, Mr. John Hurley, No. 265, Bowery, New York, to enable him to distribute his paper gratuitously to our countrymen in America who are anxious to read and think for themselves. We agree with Mr. Hurley, that it requires very different reading from the ordinary tract to meet the wants of inquiring Roman Catholics; and while he conducts his journal in the spirit of candid inquiry and fair reasoning, he may feel secure of our cordial sympathy and co-operation.*

Correspondence.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The following thoughts suggested themselves to the writer on reading Mr. Rourke's letter, in your last number.

Mr. Rourke "discovers the infallibility of the Church in the positive and unequivocal promises of our Lord Jesus Christ;" but Mr. Rourke overlooks the fact, repeatedly proved in Scripture, that God's promises are *contingent*, and require that man shall faithfully and honestly endeavour to fulfil his part, no other infallible guides than God's Word and God's Spirit being anywhere revealed. Take, for instance, the call of Moses and Aaron—"I will be with thy mouth and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do."—Exod. iv. 15. Immediately after this Moses and Aaron assembled the people, informed them of the commission they had received, and "*did signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed.*"—Exod. iv. 29-31. Here, if ever, we might have acknowledged an infallible guide; yet, within a few short weeks, at the request of the people, Aaron takes the lead in a gross act of idolatry.—Exod. xxxii. 1-6. The people were weary of waiting upon God according to his own word, and desired something more tangible and exciting, and induced him, who should have restrained them, to join in their sin. Just so with the Church of Rome.

The Scriptures were a sufficient guide (infallible in themselves, still to be interpreted by fallible men), but the people liked not the spirituality of the simple faith: they required something more externally attractive, and their guides, seeing this disposition—seeing, also, the wealth and power that would accrue to themselves from a more gorgeous ritual—did as Aaron had done, forget God, and reared up a golden idol in his place.

Again, we are told (Deut. ix. 20), that "the Lord was very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him." He who was preternaturally called to a special mission, and promised Divine guidance in word and deed, was well nigh destroyed at its very commencement (and only saved by the prayer of another), because he was not faithful in that committed to him. Indeed, God himself declares that his promises are conditional.—"*At what instant I shall speak concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them.*"—Jer. xviii. 9, 10.

Let Mr. Rourke refer to the apocalyptic Churches, founded by the Apostles and apostolic men, and at the period when the Spirit addressed them under the presidency of the Apostle John, and he will see that the general promises of Christ do not secure infallibility to any Church, and that corporate bodies, even when under the rule of inspired heads, are not infallible. The Church of Ephesus had fallen, and was warned to repent or to be cut off. The Church at Ephesus was planted by St. Paul, who resided there "three years," earnestly preaching the truth.—Acts xx. 31. He appointed his own successor to watch over it, with whom he was in frequent communication; and shortly before his death he wrote his celebrated Epistle to them, in which he declares that they are "fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." Here, then, was a Church which must have participation in all Christ's promises, yet even during the life of the beloved disciple who dwelt with her she had fallen; therefore the promises of Christ, together with the inspection of its rulers, do not assure infallibility to any Church. Still Christ's promises shall never fail—he is ever with his Church militant on earth, and will so continue till, triumphant in heaven, it beholds His glory.

Another argument against the pretension to infallibility is supplied by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans. Speaking of the Jews, he says—"Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the

natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee; behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, *if thou continue in his goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*" This language, addressed by an inspired Apostle to the very Church of Rome, ought to have warned her against all assumption of high-sounding titles, and especially against that pretension to infallibility which belongs not to anything of earth, for if infallible, it must "*continue in the goodness of God,*" and then there could be no alternative of "*cutting off.*" Mr. Rourke asserts that all God's works are perfect—not absolutely so; they have all the elements of perfection, but being committed to imperfect agents they fall short of the mark. God had built up the Jewish nation and the Jewish Church; but both the civil and ecclesiastical state fell so far short of perfection that God frequently expresses His displeasure against them, and thus speaks to Jeremiah—"Behold, that which I have built I will break down, and that which I have planted I will pluck up, even this whole land." The general assertion, therefore, that all God's works are perfect after they come into the hands of man, is erroneous; but, if it were true, what can the Church of Rome plead more than Israel and Judah that infallibility should be hers?

Your obedient servant,

BEDALE.

ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD AND THE BURIAL SERVICE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Since you have so peremptorily decided (C. L., Vol. ii., No. 21., page 106), that the question of purgatory is settled, as far as the Fathers of the first three centuries are concerned, it may appear preposterous in me again to recur to a subject thus summarily disposed of, and particularly so, as the references supplied by *Diego* are intended as the seal of your adjudication; but as these references are rather indefinite in application, and convey no specific information, I shall, in the first place, and I presume not "unreasonably," request to be informed, does St. Augustine mean by saying, "the Church hath rejected Origen," that the Church hath rejected all the writings of Origen? Secondly, I find Origen in different parts of his writings maintaining the following points of Catholic doctrine—namely, the *real presence* in the Eucharist, confession to a priest, invocation of angels and saints, the primacy of St. Peter, celibacy of the clergy, a release out of prison when the utmost farthing is paid, the Church alone the interpreter of Holy Scripture, authority of the Church—with other points of doctrine believed and taught by the Catholic Church of the present day: In this respect, then, I also require a decided reply as to whether any of the above-mentioned points, and, if so, which of them were condemned by the fifth (Ecumenical) Council? As I am not here treating controversially on these subjects, having only alluded to them for sake of illustration, I have not considered it necessary to refer to them particularly; this I can do should I come to discuss them. In noticing your remarks on the next portion of my letter I have not to contend with anything in the shape of an argument: you cautiously avoid the question at issue. To the argument which I proposed relative to the Fathers of the fourth century, and to which I now again call your attention, you only reply by frivolous objections, unfounded assumptions, or by endeavouring to represent me arguing "*unconsciously,*" from the present in support of the primitive doctrine of the Church. I have selected an argument at once rigorous and conclusive, and strictly limited to one particular period; and the force of your objections to the principles on which I have established this argument vanishes on a candid examination of the passages which I cited from these Fathers, all of whom refer, either directly or by implication, to 1 Cor. iii., 12, 13, 14, &c., and to other corroborating texts of Scripture, and in them they can find the doctrine of a future purgation and cleansing by fire; a punishing, yet saving fire, plainly and unmistakably established. Now, let me suppose a proposition illogically stated; a principle injudiciously adopted, or even arbitrarily assumed; can such informality justify you in withholding your arguments against the doctrine of purgatory? Is it because I argue the question on principles different from yours that you put your candle under a bushel, instead of dispelling what you call the superstitious darkness of your Catholic brethren? I am a Christian by profession and a Catholic by conviction; convince me that I am wrong and I will subscribe to your doctrine, and write my name Protestant.

Mr. Thorndike says of the faithful departed, "What hinders them to receive comfort, refreshment, rest, peace, and light to sustain them in the expectation of their trial, and the anxieties they are to pass through during the time of it? And though there be hopes for those that are solicitous to live and die good Christians that they are in no such suspense, but within the bounds of the heavenly Jerusalem; yet because their condition is uncertain, and while there is hope of the better, there is also fear of the worse; therefore, the Church hath always assisted them with the prayers of the living, both for their speedy trial and easy absolution, and discharge with glory before God."—(*Just Weights and Measures*, chap. xvi. p. 107.)

In this extract we have vividly set forth the belief of the Church respecting the trial of Christian souls after death, the anxieties they suffer during their trial, the practice of

the Church in assisting them, &c., and their *absolution and discharge*—or, if you will, a pardon of their sins; and that in a third place, or before they were admitted within the heavenly Jerusalem; whilst, on the contrary, the burial office in the Protestant ritual excludes the idea of any such belief. It is imperative that this office be read over all (save those excepted by the rubric), and a confident hope is expressed of the salvation of all that are buried, though they may have died in a notorious state of impenitence, without any appearance or profession of reconciliation to God; they may, in fact, have lived most notoriously infamous lives—have been Deists or Atheists, and continued so to their last moments; and not having been formally excommunicated, it is presumed of each such person in the burial office (which cannot be refused him) being read over his remains, that he is within the bounds of the heavenly Jerusalem; "that when we depart this life we may rest in him, as our hope is, *this our brother doth,*" is the burden of the prayer. Hence, it is evident that the Protestant doctrine of prayers for the dead is utterly different from that of the early Church, which prayed only for those who died in the sincere profession of the Catholic faith; as also from the doctrine of the Catholic Church of the present day, which refuses to pray for incorrigible, impenitent sinners. It is useless, in an affair of such importance, and when the evidence is so decidedly against you, to endeavour, by any evasive gloss, to ignore the fact, that in this *dogma* of Protestant doctrine there must be something radically wrong; and how this can be tolerated in a Church which claims to itself the exclusive privilege of being truly Evangelical, you will be called upon to explain. I ask you, was the Church founded by the Apostles so utterly defective in any of its constituent principles? I answer emphatically—No. You may reply, that the connection of your Church with the State has authorized the practice; but can that be any justification of the fact? Can it be consistent with rational charity that, on such an awful occasion, this office, in the name of religion, should be read most solemnly over the remains of a notorious impugner of religion; a debauched and abandoned libertine, or a professed unbeliever, and a hope expressed that he is with God; and that we are to be his future companions in glory? No prayer is offered to entreat comfort, refreshment, &c., to sustain him during his trial to obtain his absolution and discharge from his sins; but the presumptuous hope is expressed that he is with God.

That it may appear how just the foregoing observations are, I shall quote the opinions of some learned Divines of the Protestant Church on this same subject:—

"It must be owned, and it is too plain to be denied, that in such cases as you mention, of men cut off in the midst of notorious sins, drunkenness, adultery, murder, &c., this office is wholly improper; and sure, we need not doubt but that at length some regard will be had to the repeated desires of many of the best defenders of the Church, and this ground of objection against it be wholly removed." (Reas. of Conformity, page 62—By the Bishop of Winchester.)

Here is the evil admitted; also the inability of the Church to supply a remedy. Archbishop Tillotson says, "Was the ancient discipline of the Church in any degree put in practice now, in what shoals and herds would men be driven out of the communion of the Church" (Vol. I., Sermon 67). To the same purpose we have Dr. Wheatley (arguing the cases of *ipso facto* excommunications, p. 494), declaring "the consequence would be, we presume, that this office (the Burial Office) would comparatively be but seldom read."

This brings me to consider next your alleged charge against Catholics with respect to their ignorance of the first principles of Protestants; a charge which I think the foregoing observations have rendered wholly groundless.

Requesting you will show how the question of prayers for the dead, as I have stated, to be the practice of the Protestant Church, can be supported by Scripture authority, I have the honour to remain,

Sir, yours in sincere Christian charity,

EDMOND POWER.

As Mr. Power finds it so hard to understand what is meant by the assertion that "the Church hath rejected Origen," we must endeavour to throw a little light on the subject by a parallel case. He will admit, we suppose, that the Church of Rome has rejected Martin Luther. Does this mean that the Church of Rome rejects every doctrine that Martin Luther believed, and that she does not teach the doctrines of the Incarnation or the Trinity, because those truths were acknowledged by Luther? Surely not. Or again, does it mean that the Church of Rome only rejects those of Luther's opinions which she specially names, and that on every other point we may be quite sure that Luther and she perfectly agree? Not that either. But the Church of Rome having rejected Martin Luther, is no longer concerned what truths he may hold, or what falsehoods he may propound; he cannot be understood as having a right to represent her sentiments. Suppose now that a Protestant were to assert that the Church of Rome held that the moon was made of green cheese, and that the angels smoke tobacco, and should give as a proof his assertion that those propositions were to be found somewhere in the works of Martin Luther, what would Mr. Power reply? He would say, unless you give me references I cannot be expected to believe on your bare word that Luther did believe these strange propositions; but even if he did, it is nothing

* We are sorry to find the C. L. has not reached Mr. Hurley regularly. We are assured by our publisher that it has been regularly forwarded, as published, monthly.